EXHIBIT C

Southland Transcript Excerpt

Casse 220-11011318-TNB10 Doc 3136-3 Fifete 0 5/0/8/2/23 Page 4 2 fo 6 17

1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
2	DIST	RICT OF DELAWARE
3	IN RE:	. Chapter 11
4	SOUTHLAND ROYALTY COMPANY	. Case No. 20-10158 (KBO)
5		. Courtroom No. 1 . 824 North Market Street
6		. Wilmington, Delaware 19801 .
7	Debtors	s May 8, 2020 3:30 P.M.
8		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE KAREN B. OWENS UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
10		
11	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:	
12	11	M. Blake Cleary, Esquire Sean M. Beach, Esquire
13	11	Elizabeth S. Justison, Esquire YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR LLP
14] 	Rodney Square 1000 North King Street
15		Wilmington, Delaware 19801
16	-	- and -
17	<u> </u>	C. Luckey McDowell, Esquire Ian E. Roberts, Esquire
18	11	SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP 2828 N. Harwood Street, Suite 1800
19	I	Dallas, Texas 75201
20	Audio Operator:	Al Lugano
21	 Transcription Company:	Reliable
22		1007 N. Orange Street Wilmington, Delaware 19801
23		(302)654-8080 Email: gmatthews@reliable-co.com
24	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript	
25	produced by transcription service.	

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Well, I very much appreciate the time of the witnesses today and, of course, the presentations of the parties. I also appreciate the perhaps uncomfortable position that Mr. Bifferato is in, as I know from private practice, that no professional likes to object to compensation and retention issues.

But upon consideration of all of the issues, I am going to overrule the objection of the agents and enter the retention orders, either as been presented with respect to Jefferies or as will be revised in accordance with the agreement between the committee and the debtors as reflected or as discussed on the record today.

I am just simply not persuaded by the arguments today (indiscernible) the retention of the committee's professionals, as has been suggested for a number of reasons. The first is, of course, that the debtors voluntarily sought the protections of this Court and the Code and under the Code, the committee was formed and it now owes fiduciary duties to it constituents.

And in its business judgment the committee has determined that it requires the aid of two financial advisors to accomplish those tasks and to fulfill their duties. And uncertainty, as the record showed, played a part in that decision-making and such uncertainty has clearly only

worsened.

I find that that judgment is reasonable, based on the circumstances of these proceedings and the evidence presented and I feel that the advisors will be performing two different functions. They understand the need to avoid duplication and they have taken steps to avoid it.

There's no evidence of a compensation structure, as proposed, is unreasonable when compared to other similar engagements and there's no -- there's mechanisms for review of the fees and expenses, should duplication occur and the other unreasonable fees and expenses be incurred.

I think it's critical, I feel that the members of the committee understand, based on the declarations and the testimony today, but more so in the declarations that were submitted into evidence, that they understood that their professionals and all professionals need to increase the recoveries for unsecured creditors' costs when they made the retention decisions and, quite frankly, committee costs should not come as a surprise to lenders or any others who frequently practice before the Bankruptcy Courts.

I, of course, do take pause that Jefferies will be incurring a monthly fee while the Wamsutter sales process is on pause. That, perhaps, gives me the most pause, but I have no evidence that Jefferies will not be working during that time and, actually, there was testimony that the work is

possible -- that work is possible during the pause on the sales process.

And there's been no modified compensation arrangement that's been presented to me with respect to the debtors' own investment banker and there is a Section 330 review for the U.S. Trustee (indiscernible) Jefferies' application, as well as other professionals' applications is necessary to be utilized and I would think that collecting a fee for performing no work would be a basis for a good faith objection. I make no comment as to what the outcome of that objection would be.

Admittedly, I struggle with these types of retention and compensation issues. I find them extremely tricky, because I do believe that the Court and professionals should always be mindful and work to manage fees and expenses incurred in cases so that they do not become unreasonable either on an individual basis or a collective basis, but I have always believed and continue to believe that most professionals act responsibly to manage the incurrence of their fees and expenses during cases as circumstances and outcomes shift and changes for stakeholders occur, and I expect that the same will occur here as the cases progress.

And I, of course, expect all professionals in these cases do the same, but for the reasons I just set forth, I will not deny the committee's retention applications

today.

So, when do you anticipate that you would like to -- well, let me rephrase.

Do I have the Jefferies order in front of me, at least, that I can enter following the conclusion of today's hearing or am I waiting on both sets of orders?

MR. GRILLO: Your Honor, I think there are two orders. The Conway order, I know it needs to be modified, obviously, to reflect the change that was presented today.

I think the Jefferies order is not subject to any amendment. I'm just checking with Mr. Alaniz to make sure.

MR. ALANIZ: That's correct on the screen.

MR. GRILLO: Okay. So, the Jefferies order should be good and we'll follow, making the change that has been agreed upon with the debtor to the Conway MacKenzie order.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I will go ahead and enter the Jefferies retention order, following the conclusion of today's hearing and I'll wait to receive the Conway MacKenzie revised order under certification of counsel at some point in the near future.

Is there anything else that we should be addressing at today's hearing or can we call it adjourned?

MR. GRILLO: Only that this turned out to be, from a technological perspective, more successful than I had originally feared. So, I want to thank the Court for its

accommodation. 1 2 THE COURT: Not a problem. I concluded a seven-3 hour Zoom evidentiary hearing yesterday and this one went 4 much more smoothly probably because people's phones and iPads are not dying from a loss of battery use from the extended 6 time that we were all using them. So, this one went much better. 7 So, thank you all for participating. I appreciate 8 9 all the accommodations that you clearly gave each other for 10 getting here today and let's consider this hearing adjourned 11 and we can all leave our virtual meetings and sign off. 12 Everyone have a great evening. 13 COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 (Proceedings concluded at 4:54 p.m.) 15 16 17 18 CERTIFICATE 19 20 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the 21 electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-22 entitled matter. 23 /s/Mary Zajaczkowski May 15, 2020 24 Mary Zajaczkowski, CET**D-531 25